

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK----- X  
**ULLAH MOHAMMAD,**

Plaintiff,

– against –

**SRI HARTIMAA INC., et al.,**Defendants.  
----- X**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT  
AND RECOMMENDATION**

21-CV-179 (AMD) (PK)

**ANN M. DONNELLY**, United States District Judge:

On January 13, 2021, the plaintiff, Ullah Mohammad, commenced this action against Sri Hartimaa Inc. and Sher Bhdur Karki. (ECF No. 1.) On April 1, 2021, the defendants answered the complaint. The parties subsequently proceeded to mediation, and on March 18, 2022, informed the court that they settled the matter in principle. (ECF No. 21.) The parties filed their consent motion for settlement approval on June 16, 2022. (ECF No. 26.) On June 27, 2022, United States Magistrate Judge Peggy Kuo directed parties to “explain why Section 4 of the Settlement Agreement [] governing Waiver and Release covers claims not limited to wage and hour claims.” She also directed the plaintiff to file corrected documents as well as “contemporaneous timesheets and expenses to support his request for attorneys’ fees.” The parties filed their motion for approval of the amended settlement agreement on August 4, 2022, (ECF No. 31), and the next day I referred the motion to Judge Kuo for a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”).

On August 11, 2022, Judge Kuo issued the R&R in which she recommended that the Court approve the proposed amended settlement agreement. Judge Kuo found “that the settlement amount and payment plan are fair and reasonable, [and] that the releases are

appropriately limited to wage and hour claims . . . .” She also found that attorneys’ fees of \$10,000 are reasonable as less than the lodestar amount. No objections have been filed to the Report and Recommendation, and the time for doing so has passed.

In reviewing a Report and Recommendation, a district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Where, as here, no party has objected to the magistrate judge’s recommendation, “a district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record.” *Urena v. New York*, 160 F. Supp. 2d 606, 609-10 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (quoting *Nelson v. Smith*, 618 F. Supp. 1186, 1189 (S.D.N.Y. 1985)).

I have carefully reviewed Judge Kuo’s Report and Recommendation for clear error and find that there is none. Accordingly, I adopt the Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

**SO ORDERED.**

s/Ann M. Donnelly

---

Ann M. Donnelly  
United States District Judge

Dated: Brooklyn, New York  
September 9, 2022